

Notice is hereby given to Members of the Arizona State Parks Board (Board) and the general public that there will be a General Parks Board meeting, to begin on WEDNESDAY, May 11, 2011 at 9:00 AM pursuant to A.R.S. § 38-431.02 and A.R.S. § 41-511.01 *et. seq.* at the Arizona State Parks Offices located at 1300 W. Washington St., Phoenix, AZ. The public portion of the meeting will begin at 10:00 AM (time certain).

The Board may elect to hold an Executive Session for any agendized item at any time during the meeting to discuss or consult with its legal counsel for legal advice on matters listed on this agenda pursuant to A.R.S. §38-431.03 (A) (3). Items on the Agenda may be discussed out of order, unless they have been specifically noted to be set for a time certain. Public comment will be taken. The Board will discuss and may take action on the following matters.

AGENDA

(Agenda items may be taken in any order unless set for a time certain)

- A. CALL TO ORDER FOR EXECUTIVE SESSION ROLL CALL Time Certain: 9:00 AM
- **B. EXECUTIVE SESSION** Upon a public majority vote, the Board may hold an Executive Session that is not open to the public for the following purposes:
 - 1. To discuss or consult with its legal counsel for legal advice on matters listed on this agenda pursuant to A.R.S. §38-431.03(A)(3).
 - a. Legal advice regarding the Sponsorship and Donation Policy.
- C. CALL TO ORDER ROLL CALL Time Certain: 10:00 AM
- D. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE
- E. INTRODUCTIONS OF BOARD MEMBERS AND AGENCY STAFF
 - Board Statement "As Board members we are gathered today to be the stewards and voice of Arizona State Parks and its Mission Statement to manage and conserve Arizona's natural, cultural, and recreational resources for the benefit of the people, both in our parks and through our partners."



- F. CALL TO THE PUBLIC Consideration and discussion of comments and complaints from the public. Those wishing to address the Board must register at the door and be recognized by the Chair. It is probable that each presentation will be limited to one person per organization. Action taken as a result of public comment will be limited to directing staff to study or reschedule the matter for further consideration at a later time.
- G. CONSENT AGENDA The following items of a non-controversial nature have been grouped together for a single vote without Board discussion. The Consent Agenda is a timesaving device and Board members received documentation regarding these items prior to the open meeting. Any Board member may remove any item from the Consent Agenda for discussion and a separate vote at this meeting, as deemed necessary. The public may view the documentation relating to the Consent Agenda at the Board's office: 1300 W. Washington, Suite 150A, Phoenix, Arizona.
 - 1. Approve Minutes of March 17, 2011 Arizona State Parks Board Meeting
 - 2. Approve Executive Session Minutes of March 17, 2011 Arizona State Parks Board Meeting
- H. DIRECTOR'S SUMMARY OF CURRENT EVENTS The Executive Director may update the Arizona State Parks Board on special events and accolades. A list of items to be discussed under this agenda item will be posted on the State Parks website (azstateparks.com) 24 hours in advance of the Parks Board meeting.

I. DISCUSSION ITEMS

5

9

11

12

14

15

16

- 1. Revenue Forecast by Major Fund and Park Visitation Update
- 2. Request for Information (RFI) for 3rd Party Management in Arizona State Parks Update
- 3. Commission on Privatization and Efficiency (COPE) Report Update
- 4. State Parks Operations Status Update
- 5. State Park Construction Project Update
- 6. Sponsorship and Donation Policy Update
- 7. 2011 Legislative Session Recap
- 8. Strategic Plan Progress
- 9. Arizona Highways/Arizona State Parks Partnership
- 10. Agency Management Performance Plan
- J. BOARD ACTION ITEMS
 - 1. Off-Highway Vehicle Advisory Group (OHVAG) Issues The Arizona State Parks Board may vote to take a position or provide direction to staff concerning the Off-Highway Vehicle Advisory Group, including but not limited to, membership, expenses and administration (see report for details).



- 19
- 2. Consider Semi-Annual Membership Solicitation for all Arizona State Parks Board Appointed Advisory Committees – Staff recommends that the Arizona State Parks Board direct staff to conduct a public solicitation to find qualified people interested in serving on the Board's Advisory Committees twice per year.

20

 Consider Policy on Board Member Contact Information to Share with the Public - Staff recommends that the Arizona State Parks Board approve a policy on what contact information will be shared with the public including mailing address, email address and phone number.

K. TIME AND PLACE OF NEXT MEETING AND CALL FOR FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

- 1. Staff recommends that the next Arizona State Parks Board Meeting be on Wednesday, June 22, 2011 and Thursday, June 23, 2011 at University Park Marriott in Tucson, AZ.
- 2. Board members may wish to discuss issues of interest to Arizona State Parks and request staff to place specific items on future Board meeting agendas.

L. ADJOURNMENT

Pursuant to Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), Arizona State Parks does not discriminate on the basis of a disability regarding admission to public meetings. Persons with a disability may request a reasonable accommodation, such as a sign language interpreter, by contacting the acting ADA Coordinator, Nicole Armstrong-Best, (602) 542-7152; or TTY (602) 542-4174. Requests should be made as early as possible to allow time to arrange the accommodation.

Renée E. Bahl, Executive Director

4/28/11 4:17 PM



Title: Request for Information (RFI) for 3rd Party Management

in Arizona State Parks Update

Staff Lead: Kent Ennis, Assistant Director

Date: May 11, 2011

Status to Date:

At the November 17, 2010 Arizona State Parks Board meeting, the Board authorized the Executive Director to prepare and issue a Request for Information (RFI), to ascertain generally, what products and services potential concessionaires would or would not want to provide at Arizona State Parks (ASP).

The RFI was issued December 20, 2010 with responses due January 31, 2011. ASP received six responses from private organizations. A review team consisted of Arizona State Parks staff and outside individuals with expertise in park concession management or public-private partnerships. At the March 17, 2011 Arizona State Parks Board meeting, staff presented a summary of general themes in the responses to the RFI and a comparison of Arizona State Parks current operations to RFI responses.

The Parks Board agreed upon three goals to guide private partnerships: 1) Reduce net costs/Increase net revenue 2) Keep parks open and operating 3) Protect natural and cultural resources. After that Board discussion on March 17, 2011, and in order to collect additional information, telephone interviews were conducted with the six RFI respondents by Arizona State Parks staff on April 14 and 15, 2011.

Overall, all six respondents expressed interest in having the opportunity to bid on a RFP when issued. Interest varied from whole park/multi park operation to service/amenities contracts. Possible contract lengths ranged from 1 year to 25 years. Almost all preferred longer contracts to enable them to spread out their risk and recover investments. Most respondents will consider bundling the management of a group of parks if the arrangement is financially viable providing an opportunity for profit.

The following summarizes the responses from the six RFI respondents to followup questions.

The respondents were asked what would the ideal RFP be, taking into consideration the following six areas that either were not touched upon in most of the RFI responses or functions of Arizona State Parks not addressed in the RFI. While there was not much initial interest in the operation of small or historic parks or natural areas, all respondents said that they would at least consider these opportunities in the future. However, these considerations would be situation dependent and have to be financially viable. Respondents

experience in the operation and interpretation of these sites varied from none to fairly extensive. Some suggested that State Parks or local governments should continue to operate these places.

Some respondents suggested that ASP needs to identify specific needs in order for concessionaires to respond. Bottom line: The RFP has to make financial sense to private operator.

Natural and cultural resource protection. Various proposed solutions consisted of: 1.) A private operator convening an "all star team" to address resource protection issues (e.g., people from Nature Conservancy, etc.) 2.) It is the responsibility of ASP to monitor the resource. ASP writes the plans; the concessionaire follows it. 3.) Private operators would be partners with ASP in this arena. 4.) The private operator takes a holistic look at the property from built structures to natural and cultural resources and develops a plan. 5.) Works with ASP ("the landlord") to identify sensitive areas and protect them.

Deferred maintenance. A private operator is able to put resources (finances and staff) towards deferred maintenance if the contract with ASP is long enough. From the perspective of a private operator, longer is better. Maintenance reserves can be set aside (aka fee offsets, etc.) out of gross revenues in the contract, or part of franchise/lease fees. Another approach would be for ASP to take a percentage of gross revenues, and the private gets the rest. It is important that maintenance issues are documented and prioritized by ASP and the private operator at the outset.

Existing infrastructure needs. Assess needs at each location – private operator and Arizona State Parks do this separately. Get together, compare notes and prioritize needs.

Current agency programs (e.g., reservation system, annual passes, volunteer program, site steward program, Friends groups, etc.) Responses focused only on volunteers and Friends Groups. One respondent stated that Federal law precludes a private operator from maintaining a work force of volunteers. Most private operators have experience working with Friends Groups.

Is bundling an option for your organization (defined as taking on parks that operate at a net loss in combination with parks that operate at a net gain)? Typically respondents would consider bundling if: 1) the bundling arrangement was financially viable, providing an opportunity for profit. 2) Could bundle unprofitable parks with profitable parks but would expect to make an overall profit. Have seen this type of bundling work and not work. 3)

Bundling of parks geographically. This could build synergies and work better operationally. 4) Bundling all of park properties would provide smaller return on investment to Parks versus bundling the highest volume parks. 5) One said it has

many contracts where properties are bundled. 6) If there is an overall loss, they may have to reconsider their contract.

In what functional areas that are currently being performed/addressed by Arizona State Parks would your company excel? Day to day operations at parks, especially those with ties to revenues. Some said they have extensive resources and experience in sales and marketing, reservation system and call center, web traffic and use of social media. They also said they would focus on communicating with visitors before the visit, when they are on-park and after the visit through surveys.

In your experience would private entities be interested in statewide / regional / functional service contracts providing services/amenities while ASP maintains operational management? Some respondents were interested; others were not and were only interested in the operation of whole parks, or multiple parks. However, there was a range of different answers to this question indicating that Arizona State Parks is likely to have respondents for RFP's for whole park operations, service contracts, ancillary services — again, dependent up on the economics of the deal. Some displayed interest in developing relationships with local law enforcement in the operation of whole parks. Some respondents have seen effective response times from local law enforcement agencies. One respondent felt that some of the law enforcement issues at parks could be perceived versus real.

Would there be a minimum length of contract? Some respondents felt one year would be minimum length of contract. There were some indications that it takes one to two years just to understand a business and three to five years to start moving a business forward. Short-term contracts typically don't allow the respondent to obtain financing. One respondent indicated that a 10 to 15-year contract could be too long; that interests and priorities may change. Other respondents indicated that 10, 15, 20-year contracts are good for both parties and saves both parties money. Some respondents indicated it is important to have the ability to renew a contract.

How would a public-private partnership between Arizona State Parks and a private concessionaire contribute to the maintenance of existing community support and build support in the future? There was a range of responses: 1) We don't answer to another public or non-profit entity 2) ASP staff would remain liaisons with other public or non-profit entities. 3) They would be very involved/engaged with the communities surrounding the parks/places that they operate. There were responses that it is State Parks' role to be the community liaison, contract manager and responsible for addressing strategic issues.

Assuming that private entities are operating a park or portions of a park, where the private entities are operating at a profit, how would existing deferred maintenance be addressed, with a 5-year contract, 10-year contract, 15-year contract? Longer contracts enable private operators to spread out their risk and recoup investments. Possible contract lengths ranged from one year to 25-years. Almost all preferred longer contracts, especially if ASP wants the contractor to address deferred or capital maintenance. Some respondents indicated they could assume responsibility for minimum maintenance, however major or deferred maintenance would be capped at a certain dollar amount, then the agency has the responsibility. One respondent indicated a typical contract would be 5/10 years with the ability to renew 5/10 years. Typically, 30-year contracts involve a large capital maintenance investment. Bottom line: The private operator has to meet their required return on investment.

Additional Comments from Respondents:

- Would add overall goal: Creating awareness through marketing.
- It is the goal of the private operator to provide an exceptional visitor experience.
- Public wants parks to remain open. Thus it was the opinion that the public would welcome the private section operation of the Park(s).
- If current employees were displaced, the comment was made that there
 could be animosity if private sector employees were working alongside
 public sector employees.
- There is a need for the private operator to propose and review specific revenue generating opportunities, such as lodging (cabins, yurts), stores / gift shops.
- Felt private sector staffing involved quality employees due to the use of retirees as the work force who typically having secondary education and upper level jobs when they were employed.
- Investment is formula driven.
- Typical for private sector to run park operations from A to Z.

Upcoming Activities:

- RFI team meeting to address additional information received from the RFI Respondents
- Arizona State Parks staff cost of parks service analysis
- Continued discussions with BLM, USFS regarding existing land restrictions

Time Frame/Target Date for Completion:

Updates will be presented at a future Parks Board meeting.

Relevant Past Board Actions:

November 17, 2010 Board approval for the Executive Director to issue a Request for Information for 3rd Party Management in Arizona State Parks. On March 17, 2011 the Parks Board reviewed a summary of RFI responses.



Title:

State Parks Operations Status Update

Staff Lead:

Jay Ream, Assistant Director

Date:

May 11, 2011

Status to Date:

The Arizona State Parks Board worked hard to keep parks open by both leveraging existing public and private partnerships and building new relationships. The attached summary describes current operations.

Upcoming Activities:

- Arizona State Parks (ASP) will reopen Lyman Lake State Park from June 17, 2011 to October 17, 2011 through an agreement with Apache County. On December 22, 2010 ASP submitted a letter to the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) requesting a review of issues regarding third-party operations at Lyman Lake State Park.
- The Parks Board approved the release of a Request for Proposal (RFP) for the operation of the Lodge at Tonto Natural Bridge on January 12, 2011. The RFP is currently being drafted, but the RFP will not be released until the damage due to the winter storm has been repaired.
- Arizona State Parks continues to review the responses from the Request for Information (RFI) regarding the feasibility of third-party management in Arizona State Parks. Staff has met with each respondent for follow-up discussions.
- Staff is renewing partnership agreements (schedule attached).
- Picacho Peak State Park will close on May 16, 2011 and reopen on September 15, 2011. Park will close for the summer due to extreme heat and reduced staffing.

Time Frame/Target Date for Completion:

- Fort Verde State Historic Park renew agreement with Town of Camp Verde effective date April 1, 2011 this agreement is for April – June 30, 2011. Executed on April 25, 2011. ASP and the Town will amend and renew its agreement for FY2012 in June 2011.
- Red Rock State Park –Yavapai County approved renewing the agreement on April 18, 2011 to operate the Park from April 2011 through June 2012. Effective upon signing by both parties. Benefactors of Red Rock State Park approved renewing the Gift Shop operations agreement through June 30, 2012. Executed on April 25, 2011.
- Lyman Lake State Park –Apache County approved renewing the agreement on April 05, 2011 to reopen the Park from June 17 through October 17, 2011. Executed on April 25, 2011.
- Roper Lake State Park Graham County approved renewing the agreement on March 7, 2011 to operate the park June 4, 2011 – June 29, 2012. Signed by ASP on April 7, 2011.

Relevant Past Board Actions:

- RFP for Oracle State Park, June 16, 2010
- RFP for Lyman Lake State Park, September 15, 2010
- RFI for third-party management in Arizona State Parks, November 17, 2010
- RFP for the operation of the Tonto Lodge, January 12, 2011
- Parks Board has endorsed 19 partnership agreements for the operation of Arizona State Parks

Attachments:

State Parks Operations Status Update - Pages 10a-10b Partnership Agreement Status - Page 10c Title:

Operations Status Update Attachment

Date:

May 11, 2011

Agenda Item #:

1-4

A. Parks that were Never Scheduled to Close:

- 1. Buckskin Mountain State Park (SP)/River Island
- 2. Catalina SP
- 3. Cattail Cove SP
- 4. Dead Horse Ranch SP
- 5. Fool Hollow Lake Recreation Area
- 6. Kartchner Caverns SP
- 7. Lake Havasu SP
- 8. Patagonia Lake SP
- 9. Slide Rock SP

B. Parks Operated by Arizona State Parks staff through Partnership Support:

Park	Partner
Alamo Lake SP	La Paz County-\$30K
Fort Verde SHP	Town of Camp Verde
	-\$105K; Agreement
	Extended to June 30, 2011
3. Homolovi SP	Hopi Tribe - \$175,500.
4. Jerome SHP	Yavapai County-\$30K
5. Lost Dutchman SP	Friends of Lost Dutchman
	-\$24K
6. Picacho Peak SP	City of Eloy-\$20K. Park
	will close on May 16 and
	reopen on Sept.15
7. Red Rock SP	Yavapai County,
	Benefactors-\$70K
8. Riordan Mansion SHP	Arizona Historical
	Society, Riordan Action
	Network-\$78K
9. Roper Lake SP	Graham County
10. Tonto Natural Bridge SP	Town of Payson-\$15K;
•	Star Valley-\$5K;
	Friends of Tonto Natural
	Bridge-\$10K

Title:

Operations Status Update Attachment

Date:

May 11, 2011

Agenda Item #:

1-4

C. Parks Operated by Partners with no State Parks staff:

Park **Partner**

 Boyce Thompson Arboretum SP University of Arizona &

Boyce Thompson

Foundation

2. McFarland SHP Town of Florence

3. Tombstone Courthouse SHP City of Tombstone 4. Tubac Presidio SHP

Santa Cruz County & **Tubac Historical Society:**

Agreement renewed effective April 1, 2011

5. Yuma Territorial Prison SHP City of Yuma City of Yuma

6. Yuma Quartermaster Depot SHP

D. Parks that are Currently Closed to the Public:

1. Lyman Lake SP Apache County to provide

\$22,000 for seasonal

operation. Park will reopen

June 17, 2011. Parks Board directed staff to draft an RFP for park operations. Letter submitted to BLM on December 22, 2010.

RFP for 3rd party 2. Oracle SP

operations closed on October 6, 2010. No bids submitted. Re-evaluating

options.

3. San Rafael State Natural Area (SNA) Grazing special use permit

implemented, no public

access.

Title: Date:

Partnership Agreement Status Attachment May 11, 2011 I-4

Agenda Item #:

Park	IGA No.	Partner	Date Endin	g Renewal Term	
Ft. Verde	10-032	Camp Verde	6/30/2011	1 Year	
Red Rock Amendment (extend	10-045 d to 6/30/20	Yavapai Co. 112) approved 47	6/3/2011 /18, awaiting C	1 Year (2) o. singed document	
Red Rock–Connections 11-041 Benefactors 6/30/2011 Available, no set term Benefactors to consider in May, Drafting 1-year agreement extension					
Jerome	11-023	Yavapai Co.	8/31/2011	1 Year (2)	
Tonto Nat. Bridge	10-042A1	Payson	9/27/2011	1 Year (2)	
Tonto – Star Valley	11-028	Star Valley	9/27/2011	Available, no set term	
Tonto – Friends	11-031	Friends of	9/26/2011	1 Year (2)	
Homolovi	11-036	Hopi Tribe	10/19/2011	1 Year (2)	
Homolovi	11-009	Winslow	10/31/2011	1 Year (2)	
Current Agreements:					
Tubac Presidio	10-037	Santa Cruz Co.	3/31/2012	1 Year (1)	
Roper Lake	10-044	Graham Co.	6/29/2012	1 Year (1)	
Red Rock Gift Shop	11-010	Benefactors	6/30/2012	1 Year (2)	
Yuma QMD 10-0	06/11-062	Yuma	6/30/2012	3 Year (2)	
Lyman Lake 10-0	38A1	Apache Co.	12/31/2012	Available, no set term	
Riordan Mansion	10-039	AHS	3/31/2013	2 Year (2)	
Tombstone	10-035	Tombstone	3/31/2013	2 Year (2)	
Yuma Terr, Prison	10-031	Yuma	3/31/2013	3 Year (2)	
McFarland	11-027	Florence	6/30/2013	3 Year (2)	



Title: Sponsorship and Donation Policy Update

Staff Lead: Jay Ream, Assistant Director

Date: May 11, 2011

Status to Date:

The Arizona State Parks Board approved the draft Sponsorship and Donation policy and authorized staff to seek public input at the February 23, 2011 Parks Board meeting. Staff sought comments from the general public, private corporations, the Arizona State Parks Foundation and nonprofit organizations affiliated with Arizona State Parks (ASP). ASP received four responses to the draft policy from affiliated Friends Groups. These responses have been reviewed by staff and will be incorporated into an edited draft policy. Staff will continue to seek public comments on the edited policy.

Upcoming Activities:

The public comments revealed confusion regarding sections of the policy dealing with fund raising activities by affiliated Friends Groups. Based on these comments, staff has determined that the policy needs to be presented in two parts. The first part will be the Parks Board-approved policy. This document will be the one that regulates staff in the implementation of sponsorship and donation activity. The second document will be a guideline, written in clear and concise form to assist individuals, groups, organizations and corporations when navigating the Sponsorship and Donations Policy.

Staff will edit the draft Sponsorship and Donations Policy based on the comments received and begin work on the Sponsorship and Donations Guidelines as the public document. Both the Policy and Guidelines documents will be forwarded to the general public, private corporations, the Arizona State Parks Foundation and nonprofit organizations affiliated with ASP for public comment. Staff will return to the Parks Board at a future meeting for additional consideration.

Time Frame/Target Date for Completion:

Initial public input period ended on March 31, 2011.

ASP will collect comments and input on the edited draft policy and guidelines for at least 30 days once the drafts are completed.

Relevant Past Board Actions:

- On November 17, 2010 the Parks Board discussed developing a policy for sponsorships and donations.
- February 23, 2011 the Arizona State Parks Board approved the draft Sponsorships and Donations policy and authorized staff to seek public input.

Attachments: N/A



Title: Staff Lead:

2011 Legislative Session Recap Jay Ziemann, Assistant Director

Date:

May 11, 2011

Status to Date:

The state legislature adjourned the regular session on April 20, 2011. The following is a summary of legislative action relative to State Parks.

1) SB 1332 public agencies; elected officials; communications (Antenori)

Agencies prohibited from using the internet to self-promote Never scheduled for Floor action in Senate

2) SB 1531 state parks board; director (Melvin)

Board and Executive Director serve at the pleasure of the Governor Never heard in committee

3) SB 1612 general appropriations 2011-2012 (Biggs)

In FY 2011, sweeps additional \$1.5 million
In FY 2012, increases spending authority in Enhancement Fund by \$1.1 million
In FY 2012, sweeps \$2.4 million from various funds
Signed by Governor Brewer, Chapter 24

4) SB 1624 environment budget reconciliation bill (Biggs)

Makes necessary statutory changes to reconcile FY 2012 State budget Transfers an additional \$250,000 from Law Enforcement Boating Safety Fund (LEBSF)

 Provision to privatize two parks, stripped from final bill Signed by Governor Brewer, Chapter 36

5) HB 2196 state parks; privatization (Seel)

Grants authority to the Board to contract with private vendors. Park lands must remain public.

Never heard in committee

6) HB 2227 – Separate funds; donations; transfer prohibited (Fillmore)

Would prohibit sweeps of any agency donations account Signed by Governor Brewer, Chapter 194

7) HB 2239 state parks board; membership (Goodale)

Replaces one of the cattle industry appointees with a tourism professional Signed by Governor Brewer, Chapter 216

8) HB 2314 Lake Improvement; Boating Safety; Funds (Jones, et. al.)

- Transfers the appropriation of the LEBSF from State Parks to Game & Fish:
- Establishes the State Fee Commission
- Makes \$399,000 from Racing Regulation Fund available to Department of Racing, and \$1,000 from Racing Regulation Fund available to State Parks in the State Lake Improvement Fund
- Effective in FY2013

 Transmitted to Governor Brewer

9) HB 2394 sustainable state parks fee; fund (Jones) Mandatory fee, established by Board, tied to vehicle license. Withdrawn from primary Committee

10) HB 2524 – S/E Re-establishment of State Parks Heritage Fund (Jones) No action in primary Committee

Relevant Past Board Actions:

At the March 17, 2011 Board meeting, the Board voted to oppose SB 1531.



Title: Strategic Plan Progress

Staff Lead: Jay Ziemann, Assistant Director

Date: May 11, 2011

Status to Date:

The Board adopted a Strategic Plan in October 2010 that highlighted five goals: Resources, Visitors, Planning, Partnerships and Communications. Since October, State Parks management has attempted to capture the work product of staff, and determine the most effective way to communicate the efforts to accomplish the goals of the Plan.

Upcoming Activities:

An update detailing the agency's progress on the Strategic Plan will be distributed at the Board meeting.

Time Frame/Target Date for Completion:

The execution of the Strategic Plan is ongoing.

Relevant Past Board Actions:

The Parks Board formally adopted the Strategic Plan on October 20, 2010.

Attachments:

Agency Strategic Plan 2010 with Goals and Objectives - Pages 14a-14b

ARIZONA STATE PARKS AGENCY STRATEGIC PLAN 2010 GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

MISSION: Managing and conserving Arizona's natural, cultural and recreational resources

for the benefit of the people, both in our Parks and through our Partners.

VISION: Arizona State Parks is indispensable to the Economies, Communities and

Environments of Arizona.

GOAL: Resources

To provide sustainable management of our natural, cultural,

recreational, economic and human resources.

Objective A. By keeping all parks economically viable and open to the public.

Objective B. By standardizing and upgrading the information technology

infrastructure.

Objective C. By efficiently processing grants, projects, paperwork and documents

through the agency.

Objective D. By increasing each staff member's knowledge, skills and abilities

through training opportunities.

Objective E. By providing agency staff with a stimulating, safe, and challenging

work environment.

GOAL: Visitors

To provide safe, meaningful and unique experiences for our visitors,

volunteers and citizens.

Objective A. By working with agency personnel to implement and update the master

list of economically feasible facility upgrades that improve the visitor

experience and increase revenue.

Objective B. By working with agency personnel to market events and improve the

overall quality of existing events.

Objective C. By striving to operate the visitor interface component of the Park

System with a "cost neutral" budget where visitor revenue equals or

exceeds direct visitor costs.

GOAL: Planning

To document our progress through planning, analysis and research.

- Objective A. By collecting scientific and historical data on natural and cultural resources to better inform decision-making.
- Objective B. By updating the long-term Capital Improvement Plan.
- Objective C. By continuing to provide accurate, timely, and targeted agency reports on program management and analysis for internal and external use.
- Objective D. By continuing to implement the Revised State Historic Preservation Plan.

GOAL: Partnerships

To build lasting public and private partnerships to promote local economies, good neighbors, recreation, conservation, tourism and establish sustainable funding for the agency.

- Objective A. By continuing and expanding collaboration with federal, tribal, state, and local governments, non-governmental organizations (NGOs), concessionaires and private sector individuals whose objectives or duties are similar to State Parks.
- Objective B. By implementing a community relations plan that addresses each park's unique location, program audience, and adjacent and thematic communities.
- Objective C. By continuing partnership training on agency programs, planning and activities.
- Objective D. By working with Stakeholders to create and promote a strategy for sustainable agency funding.

GOAL: Communications

To effectively communicate with the public, policy makers, our partners, our peers and ourselves.

- Objective A. By enhancing the marketing plan.
- Objective B. By enhancing the public relations plan.
- Objective C. By enhancing agency internal communications including electronic posting of information.



Title:

Arizona Highways/Arizona State Parks Partnership

Staff Lead:

Jay Ziemann, Assistant Director

Date:

May 11, 2011

Status to Date:

As of March 2011, there have been 591 subscriptions associated with the *Arizona Highways* partnership, which helps both State Parks and the Magazine. The Arizona State Parks Foundation receives \$5 per month for each new subscriber. The program runs through the end of 2011. The Parks donation now totals \$2,955.

The public can subscribe on the *Arizona Highways* website: http://www.arizonahighways.com/stateparks.html

Arizona Highways magazine's May Issue features Arizona State Parks with award-winning photography, travel journalism and a steadfast commitment to discovering Arizona's State Parks and their splendor. The magazine has been the premier travel publication for Arizonans for more than 80 years. Helping to drive tourism to and through the state, *Arizona Highways* has subscribers in all 50 states and more than 120 countries. The website will feature the State Parks for the entire month and that page receives 28,000 views per month.

Arizona Highways has been working with AAA, which is running full-page ads to support Arizona State Parks not only in Arizona Highways, but also in their magazine.

Upcoming Activities:

Arizona Highways also coordinated a Sedona Chamber Music - Blue Grass Festival fundraising event at Red Rock State Park on May 7.

Time Frame/Target Date for Completion:

The subscription program will end on December 31, 2011.

Relevant Past Board Actions:

The Board received an update on the partnership at its November 17, 2010, meeting.

Attachments:

Arizona Highways/Arizona State Parks Partnership – Page 15a

Arizona Highways/Arizona State Parks Partnership Thank you for supporting Arizona's State Parks! \$5.00 of each subscription will be donated to the Arizona State Park of your choice PARK Total 1) State Parks Foundation 176 2) Alamo Lake State Park 13 3) Boyce Thompson Arboretum State Park 28 4) Buckskin Mountain State Park 5 5) Catalina State Park 19 6) Cattail Cove State Park 1 7) Dead Horse Ranch State Park 3 8) Fool Hollow Lake Recreation Area 8 9) Fort Verde State Historic Park 5 10) Homolovi State Park 27 11) Jerome State Historic Park 20 12) Kartchner Caverns State Park 13 13) Lake Havasu State Park 5 14) Lost Dutchman State Park 56 15) Lyman Lake State Park 9 16) McFarland State Historic Park 8 17) Oracle State Park 6 18) Patagonia Lake State Park 11 19) Picacho Peak State Park 26 20) Red Rock State Park 33 21) Riordan Mansion State Historic Park 10 22) Roper Lake State Park 5 23) Slide Rock State Park 23 24) Tombstone Courthouse State Historic Park 4 25) Tonto Natural Bridge State Park 56 26) Tubac Presidio State Historic Park 8 27) Yuma Quartermaster Depot State Historic Park 4 28) Yuma Territorial Prison State Historic Park **Grand Total** 591



Title:

Off-Highway Vehicle Advisory Group (OHVAG) Issues

Staff Lead:

Jay Ziemann, Assistant Director

Date:

May 11, 2011

Status to Date:

At the November 17, 2010 Arizona State Parks Board (Board) Meeting, a representative of the Off-Highway Vehicle Advisory Group (OHVAG) presented the annual report on behalf of the group. Six issues were presented for consideration. On February 25, 2011, Jay Ziemann, Assistant Director, Partnerships, attended the OHVAG meeting to discuss the issues that were presented at the November Board Meeting. At the March 17, 2011 Arizona State Parks Board meeting, an OHVAG representative revisited some of the issues presented to the Board at the November meeting, and presented three new issues.

The issues and staff comments are as follows:

- 1. OHVAG recommends that one Arizona State Parks Board member be appointed to represent Off-Highway Vehicle (OHV) interests.
 - Staff comment: Arizona State Parks Board membership is established in statute (A.R.S. §41-511), and this would require a statutory change. The next citizen-at-large position will be open in two years. The Governor may include a person with off-highway recreation interests, or any other affiliation for a member at large.
- 2. OHVAG took action at its August 8, 2010, meeting to fill a vacant position. Their recommendation was not presented to the Arizona State Parks Board until the November 17, 2010 meeting.
 - Staff comment: Please see Board Action Item #J-3.
- 3. OHVAG is involved in managing the OHV program that currently has two active funding sources that provide funds for administration of the program. Staff has been reduced in the OHV program area. OHVAG wants to know what is happening to the administration portion of the OHV Recreation Fund.
 - Staff comment: Arizona State Parks is not in a position to hire additional staff for the OHV program due to overall budget constraints and a hiring freeze.
- OHVAG would like to purchase shirts, caps, business cards, or the like to identify themselves when they represent OHVAG/State Parks at public events or conducting business.
 - Staff comment: Staff suggested providing business cards for OHVAG members and also laminating some for members use.
 The card could be printed on both sides with personal identification information and agency affiliation on one side, and promotional information on the reverse side. Information could, for example, promote the "sticker fund" and provide a website link. OHVAG was

receptive to this suggestion. Staff does not support using public funds to buy advisory committee members caps, shirts and other apparel.

- 5. OHVAG members would like to be reimbursed for travel expenses.
 - Staff comment: Due to budget constraints, none of the advisory committees or members of the Arizona State Parks Board are being reimbursed for travel at this time.
- OHVAG expressed an interest in having an OHV website and asked what would be the best way to fund a statewide OHV website/webmaster and newspaper.
 - Staff comment: Staff offered a couple of suggestions. First, Arizona State Parks already hosts an OHV section on the current agency website and provides information such as grants for projects, continuation of ambassador program, and other pertinent information. Rather than creating a new website, staff suggests enhancing the existing one. Second, if OHVAG wishes to have a new domain name (e.g. ATVAZ.com; OHVAZ.com have been mentioned), one could be purchased that then directs searchers to the existing State Parks OHV webpage. Staff also suggested contracting with a part-time person to collect OHV information from sources throughout the state to provide to our agency Webmaster to post onto the website. OHVAG was receptive and enthusiastic to these suggestions. These items will be included in the budget discussions for the OHV program at the June 2011 Arizona State Parks Board meeting.
- 7. OHVAG expressed concern that issues are not being presented to the Arizona State Parks Board or are being changed prior to their knowledge.
 - Staff comment: Per Arizona State Parks Board policy, anytime a
 committee recommendation differs from the staff recommendation,
 both recommendations are presented to the Board. A
 representative from the committee is invited to present the
 viewpoint on behalf of the committee.
- 8. OHVAG requests contact information for Parks Board members.
 - Staff comment: Please see Board Action Item #J-3.
- 9. OHVAG would prefer to have OHVAG funds spent in-house versus through the Bureau of Land Management (BLM).
 - Staff comment: Transitioning control of the OHV Ambassador Program to BLM was the appropriate thing to do as most program activities were being conducted on BLM land. The BLM has done an excellent job of maintaining and building the program. They have borne staff and support costs. They have also established a good record of "best practices" that is now being shared with the new OHV Ambassador Program Expansion grant recipient. OHVAG is being included on the "governing council" for the program that has recently been established under a memorandum of understanding with the major program sponsors: USDA Forest

Service Region 3, BLM-AZ State Office, Arizona Game & Fish Department and Arizona State Parks.

The Arizona State Park Board and staff remain committed to the goal of responsibly and efficiently getting OHV projects funded and projects on the ground.

Time Frame:

Managing the relationship with OHVAG (and all Advisory committees) is ongoing.

Staff and Financial Resources:

These efforts fall within the ongoing work responsibilities of agency staff.

Relation to Strategic Plan:

Communications Goal: To effectively communicate with the public, policy makers, our partners, our peers and ourselves.

Relevant Past Board Actions:

An OHVAG member addressed the Board at the November 17, 2010, meeting in Apache Junction, and again at the March 17, 2011, meeting in Winslow.



Title: Consider Semi-Annual Membership Solicitation for all

Arizona State Parks Appointed Advisory Committees

Staff Lead: Jay Ziemann, Assistant Director

Date: May 11, 2011

Recommended Motion:

I move that the Arizona State Parks Board direct staff to conduct a public solicitation to find qualified people interested in serving on the Board's Advisory Committees twice per year.

Status to Date:

It has been Arizona State Parks Board policy to fill vacant positions for all Advisory Committees once a year in November after advertising for all vacancies. In addition to the Off Highway Vehicle Advisory Group (OHVAG), the Arizona State Committee on Trails (ASCOT), and the Natural Areas Program Advisory Committee (NAPAC) are also struggling with quorums due to vacancies. With Board approval, staff will conduct public solicitation twice per year to find interested and qualified Arizonans to serve on Advisory Committees.

Time Frame:

In order to be more responsive to OHVAG's concerns, staff proposes to advertise immediately, and ideally, have candidates for the Board to approve at the June 2011 meeting. In subsequent years, Advisory Committee vacancies would appear on May and November agendas.

Staff and Financial Resources:

Because we no longer have an Advisory Committee coordinator, this responsibility will fall to Partnerships staff. There will also be some nominal costs associated with the solicitation.

Relation to Strategic Plan:

Communications Goal: To effectively communicate with the public, policy makers, our partners, our peers and ourselves.

Relevant Past Board Actions: N/A

Attachments: N/A



Title:

Consider Policy on Board Member Contact Information

to Share with the Public

Staff Lead:

Monica Enriquez, Executive Staff Assistant

Date:

May 11, 2011

Recommended Motion:

Staff recommends that the Arizona State Parks Board approve a policy on what contact information will be shared with the public including mailing address, email address and phone number.

Status to Date:

Members of the public, as well as members of the Parks Board's Advisory Committees, have asked for personal contact information of the individual members of the Board. Currently, staff responds to requests by giving the Board's address as the main Phoenix headquarters address: 1300 W. Washington St, Phoenix, AZ 85007. Staff does not currently give out the Board's personal or work email addresses or phone numbers.

When mail is received for the Board Members, staff scans the document and emails it to the Board's personal or work email and then mails the hard copy to the Board member's personal work or home mailing address or gives it to the Board Member when they are next in the Phoenix office.

Staff will provide to the public and members of the Parks Board's Advisory Committees whatever contact information the Board Members choose.

Time Frame:

With the Board's approval, this could be accomplished immediately.

Staff and Financial Resources:

These efforts fall within the ongoing work responsibilities of agency staff.

Relation to Strategic Plan:

Communications Goal: To effectively communicate with the public, policy makers, our partners, our peers and ourselves.

Relevant Past Board Actions: N/A